

UTAH RADIATION CONTROL BOARD

MINUTES OF THE UTAH RADIATION CONTROL BOARD MEETING, October 24, 2002, (by teleconference), 4:00 p.m., Department of Environmental Quality (Bldg #2), 168 North 1950 West, Conference Room 205, Salt Lake City, Utah.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephen T. Nelson, Ph.D., Chairman
Gary L. Edwards, M.S., Vice Chairman
William J. Sinclair, M.S.E.H., Executive Secretary
Karen S. Langley, M.S.
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Gregory G. Oman, D.D.S., B.S.
Gene White, Commissioner
Kent Bradford, P.G.

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT/EXCUSED

Rod Julander, Ph.D.
John Thomson, M.D.
Linda Kruse
Thomas K. Chism, M.S.

DRC STAFF/OTHERS PRESENT

Fred Nelson, Utah Attorney General's Office

PUBLIC

Kenneth Alkema, Envirocare of Utah, Inc.
Jay Vance, Envirocare of Utah, Inc.
Kim DeMille, Utahns Against Unfair Taxes

GREETINGS/MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The Utah Radiation Control Board convened by teleconference on October 24, 2002. Public meeting space to observe the proceedings and listen to the conference call were made available in the DEQ Building #2, Room 205, 168 North 1950 West, in Salt Lake City, Utah. The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m., by Stephen Nelson, Chairman of the Board.

VII. OTHER DEPARTMENT ISSUES (Board action item)

a. Consideration of Board position statement on Citizen's Initiative 1 - Radioactive Waste Restrictions Act

Bill Sinclair indicated that he had sent Board members a revised draft of the position statement by electronic mail. The electronic mail also summarized comments received from Board members of the first draft position statement. He stated that there were two grammatical revisions made as a result of Stephen Nelson's comments. Just prior to the conference call, a suggestion was received from Rod Julander concerning a proposed change. On page 2 of the revised draft, second paragraph, second sentence which states: "Citizens State Initiative 1, 53 pages in length, involves issues in several areas of state radiation policy. . ." Rod suggested that it would read better if the reference to 53 pages in length was removed.

Discussion by Board members:

The discussion centered on why it was necessary to remove the reference or if there was a more appropriate place to reference the length of the initiative document. Board members decided to split any vote on the position statement into two pieces. One piece would be the reference to the 53 pages in length. The other piece would be the position statement in its entirety.

Karen Langley moved that the reference to "53 pages in length" be stricken from the draft revised position statement, seconded by Gene White.

A roll call vote was held on the motion:

Stephen Nelson	<u>Aye</u>
Karen Langley	<u>Aye</u>
Kent Bradford	<u>Aye</u>
Gene White	<u>Aye</u>
Gary Edwards	<u>Aye</u>
Dr. Greg Oman	<u>Aye</u>
Dianne Nielson	<u>Abstain</u>

CARRIED AND PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0 WITH ONE ABSTENTION BY DIANNE NIELSON

Gene White then made a motion to approve the revised position statement, seconded by Kent Bradford.

A roll call vote was held on the motion:

Stephen Nelson	<u>Aye</u>
Karen Langley	<u>Aye</u>
Kent Bradford	<u>Aye</u>
Gene White	<u>Aye</u>
Gary Edwards	<u>Aye</u>
Dr. Greg Oman	<u>Aye</u>
Dianne Nielson	<u>Abstain</u>

CARRIED AND PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0 WITH ONE ABSTENTION BY DIANNE NIELSON

Discussion by Board members:

Board members discussed how to best distribute the position statement. It was determined that individual Board members could distribute the position statement (Bill would electronically mail each member a copy). Bill indicated that the position statement would be put on the Division of Radiation Control website. Board members also indicated that it would be appropriate for the Executive Secretary to distribute the position statement to the media. Bill stated that he would work with the Department Public Affairs Officer to ensure this occurred. Dianne Nielson suggested that both the proponents and opponents be provided a copy of the position statement. Bill indicated he would take the responsibility to ensure that a copy was distributed to each party.

Following the conclusion of business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.